

# THE CATHOLIC MIND

---

VOL. XL

OCTOBER 22, 1942

No. 956

---

## War Without Arms

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA, September, 1942.*

**A**LL over the world, millions are fighting without arms a war that is as bitter in its way as any of the battles over the air in Britain, on the ocean at Coral Sea or Midway, or along the Atlantic Coast of the United States, or at Rostov-on-the-Don, and beyond.

These are the indomitable Dutch . . . the sea-faring Norwegians . . . the humiliated Czechs . . . the shamed Slovaks . . . the starving Greeks . . . the embattled Jugoslavs . . . the bewildered French . . . the divided Belgians . . . the oppressed Danes . . . the wild Russians . . . yes, and the enslaved Italians and Germans . . . Chinese, too, at war for five years . . . and all kinds of funny and hitherto unknown peoples in many Eastern lands.

They are fighting a new kind of war. The battleground is their own souls. The prize of war is the winning or the loss of their souls. They lost their land to alien forces, and also their liberty and their property. They have only their souls left. And the invader is not satisfied with their liberty and their property. He wants their souls as well.

All of us here in this country have yet to learn that there is more than a mere war going on in the world. There is also a revolution. The war of conquest is a mere means to an end. It is a preliminary. It is not only land that is sought. Land is also only a means, for people live on it. It is the people that must be won. Not their bodies, or their work, or their savings, but their allegiance. And allegiance is a thing of the soul, of the inner man. It is the revolution that is the main item on the agenda.

### OBJECTIVE OF THE REVOLUTION

Let me list the specifications of that revolution.

Its main objective is what we call Western civilization: that whole body of culture, of tradition, of a way of looking at life, of a religion, of a system of ordered liberty. . . . The enemy wants that; he wants us to give it up—voluntarily, if we will; but give it up, in any case. He wants us to stop thinking, worshipping, living as we have for two thousand years, and take up a new thought, a new worship, and a new life. In this planning for a New Order, the enemy's guns are not nearly so important as his propaganda, his tanks not nearly so potent as his plans.

Here, then, are the specifications of those plans.

There is, first, *the re-introduction of human slavery*. And I mean human slavery in a real sense. Not in the old sense where one man owned another man as a chattel. But in the new sense where one race or one class or one state is the absolute master, and all the other peoples are the workers, who may not own or manage or direct the industrial and agricultural enterprises in their own land. To the Nazis, there is only one master-race, their own. All other races and peoples are destined to work for them. All these races may be moved around at the bidding of their master, must go where they are told, must work at what they are commanded.

There will be no political, or social, or economic rights. All these are privileges of the master race. The others will be helots, or serfs, or better, slaves. For slavery is being subject completely to the interests of another. Freedom is to be master of oneself. When the subject races will all have lost their lands, their sole occupation will be to work for their new lords. Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Dutch, Belgians, Norwegians, Greeks, Slavs, and most probably Italians, will have lost the right of private property, and the right of freedom of movement, as they already have lost the right of expression and worship. This, I contend, is slavery.

But slavery of the body is not enough. This conqueror insists that his captives agree with him as well. Their souls must also be slaves. They must give intellectual adherence to his thoughts, his intentions, his philosophy of life. That is what makes this revolution different from any other in the history of the world.

Lest anyone should think that this is merely my own imagining, let him get himself a copy of the bible of the Nazi New Order, and there he can satisfy himself that slavery of body and mind is what is in the mind of its author. I mean Hitler's "Mein Kampf," in which he predicted with uncanny accuracy what he has been doing all these years. There anybody can become convinced that slavery for all but one race is what is in this man's mind. It is not revenge for Versailles, or for the defeat of 1918. It lies much deeper than that. It is a deliberate attempt to do something that even Christianity or the Catholic Church has never been able to do. It is an attempt to convert all men's minds; to make them by force think the thoughts that they are told to think.

*Destruction of the moral law* is the second specification of this revolution. Hitherto, reason has been the spiritual force back of law, and cooperation for the

common good its intended fruit. That is one benefit which Christianity, after long and bitter trials, succeeded in having a large part of the world accept as a working philosophy of life.

This moral law is to go, in this revolution. Will and force are to take the place of reason and cooperation. Thus all human values are to be turned upside down. The Christian doctrine was that men's actions must find the measure of their goodness in a rule outside themselves, a natural law of their own being, yes, but a law that was put there by man's Creator, God. The New Order teaches that the measure of what is good in anything that men do originates in a human will. To do what that human will desires is good; to oppose that will is bad.

Let us see how this works out in some of our human values.

One of the things that Christianity did for Western Civilization was to get it to accept the idea that justice is the great force that regulates the relations of men with each other. By justice all men achieve a kind of equality. There is no man so low in the scale of society, in fortune or position that he may not, that he must not, be allowed to have his rights respected. By long, laborious effort, we have got it accepted that no force, no fortune, however powerful and extensive, prevails over the imponderable value of a single humble man's rights.

We may have violated this ideal; we no doubt have violated it over and over again. But at least we know that we have violated it when we do. There is always someone to stand up and denounce the outrage, and the guilty hang their heads. It seems to me that we reached the pinnacle of this ideal when in the summer we forced the august Supreme Court of the United States to come together to discuss the grave question of whether the rights of eight men who had entered this country as spies were being violated by a military

court. It was not a question of whether they were Americans, or citizens. It was simply a question that they were men and, therefore, entitled to justice.

There is none of that in the revolution that is going on. Justice is a thing that originates outside of men. It comes from God. God put the law of it in our nature, and reason formulates this law for us. But reason is not to rule any more. Only will rules. And will without reason is arbitrary, capricious, tyrannical. Both the humble and the mighty are equal before that will, true; but equally unfortunate.

Take another example. The family has been considered in Western Civilization as the unit of society. It is the irreducible unit. Man does not enter the state directly. He enters it through the family. He is a member of the state because he came from a family. Truly considered, the state is merely a collection of families. That is the Christian position.

For this new world revolution, the family has no importance whatever. It is a biological phenomenon, nothing else. The race is the only thing that counts, and husbands, wives, children, are merely material parts of the race. There is no moral law governing the family, and the mental slavery that is to be introduced will kill all the old allegiances that bind parents and children together.

Thus social order itself is destroyed by this revolution. Saint Thomas Aquinas defines order as unity in diversity. To have order, you must have unity, of course. But you must also have diversity. There is no order in a single unit; there is order only in several units. Now this New revolutionary Order will have none of diversity. There will be a monolithic state, a solid block of granite, welded together in standardized uniformity. Nor will separate states be allowed to exist in an international order. The only unity will be that of the granitic Reich, the master of all the states.

## ACCESS TO GOD DENIED

The third specification of the revolution will be that *man's access to God is denied*. This will be the last blow to Western civilization, which, with all its faults, is built on the last unbreakable truth that God is man's Creator, and that this Creator endowed man with the means to reach Him through knowledge, practice of His law and worship. If the knowledge, love and worship of God can be finally eradicated from men's souls, the last link of slavery can be forged upon them.

Now that is just what this revolution is going to do. The Catholic press and the school, two great means for imparting the knowledge of God, are taken away from the Poles, the Czechs, the Belgians, the Dutch and the rest, and in their place comes a directed press and a regimented school that will exist solely to express the will of the master race.

The practice of God's law will be hindered in every way. Youth movements embrace all the children and young people of all the countries. They meet mostly early Sunday mornings and continue all day. Sunday is a day of physical exercise to mold the body into superman, not the soul into a saint. The real law of each young person's conduct is not the law of God as taught by the Church, but the law of the race as impressed by the state.

Worship itself is to be restricted in every way. Not by direct closing of the churches. The revolution is too clever for that. You must remember that the leaders of this revolution, unlike those of most revolutions, are themselves ex-Catholics. They know that the priesthood, not the church building, as some thought, is the heart of Christian worship. It is the monastery of men and women, not the gorgeous Gothic pile, which conducts Christian worship. So the monasteries are to go, and most of them have gone in most captive Catholic countries; priests and monks are dispersed.

The inner canonical link of the Catholic system of worship is shattered.

Now all this has been said before. The Catholic press in this country has faithfully carried the magnificent bursts of defiance of Faulhaber, Von Preysing, Von Galen, Bishops of the Church in Germany. It has also printed the detailed exposes of conditions from bishops in the captive countries, broadcast originally for the most part from the Vatican radio, and then syndicated to the press week after week.

But in all this news matter I seem to see that something is lacking. It would look as if this is just another persecution like those others in Russia, Spain and Mexico. It is not like those. There is one thing that distinguishes them sharply from this. Those others just brutally tried to suppress the Christian way of life. They used the firing squad as their principal weapon. They never thought of people's minds.

This revolution—persecution, if you must have the word—is something altogether different. Those others made unwilling victims. The thing that characterizes this revolution is that it insists on making willing victims. It wants to convert, not to suppress merely. Hitler told Rauschnig, once one of his loyal followers, that when he moved on a country, that country would already be corrupted interiorly by his agents. Large numbers of the population in his intended victim country would already be converted to his way of thinking. Quisling in Norway, Mussert in Holland, Laval in France, these were merely figureheads of the internal capture of the minds of the people which would precede, and would most certainly follow, the actual invasion of mere arms.

There has never been anything exactly like this in the history of the world. The conqueror wants his conquered people to think like him, not merely act as he desires. To do this they must be cut off from their past. More than that, they must repudiate their past.

With an almost diabolical knowledge of human psychology, he has actually appealed to the two most fundamental things in human nature: the love of order and the love of security. He has promised them both—on condition that they accept them willingly from his hands. Or else—of course.

### WILL HITLER SUCCEED?

Now here is the big question we have to try to answer. What are the chances of Hitler's success in engineering the great revolution he has in mind? And in particular for us, what are his chances of success in the United States of America?

That is another way of asking: what are the weapons with which Western civilization is supplied to ward him off, and in particular what are the weapons with which we, the people of the United States, are armed, to meet this new psychological warfare? On the answer to that question, depend the chances of our warfare in mere armaments.

The modern crisis, on the face of it, seems to be twofold: to preserve the political independence of the nations which are as yet free; and to restore the independence of those captive nations which want to be free. That is a matter for the military men. It is their big job. When they have the arms to fight with, the means to get them to the fighting fronts, and the ability to deliver them against the enemy in overwhelming force—to get there fustest with the mostest—then they will have accomplished these two objectives.

But arms, ships, tanks, planes and the rest, these are not all of Hitler's weapons, and perhaps not the most efficient ones. Besides the external warfare we have to fight, there is also an internal one. And this, I think, is more important. At least the European countries found this to be true. Witness France, the greatest example.

Now, on this internal front, there are really two



actions to be waged. There is first the necessity to exclude from our own ranks the infiltration of alien influences. This is the job of the FBI, and the other secret services of our country. We can safely leave it to them, I think, judging from their success up to now.

But, I think, this is not the most important thing we have to do on this internal front. What we really have to do is to repair our own weakness in the face of a world revolution that would capture our minds and our souls. No FBI can grapple with this. It is too imponderable for the handcuff, the prison cell and the courtmartial. This revolution is directed at our minds; only our minds can deal with it.

Now what are our weaknesses in the face of this revolution? They are precisely on the lines along which the revolution is directed.

Take human slavery, as the first line of attack. We no longer have people owned by other people in the democracies. That is true. But we have large masses of people who are helpless in the face of economic pressure. We have colored races, at home in our midst and in our colonies, to whom we have not yet granted economic and social justice. We have not achieved that equality which is at the basis of democracy, the fundamental equality of all men before God and the law.

As long as we have not achieved justice at home, we are not very well armed to meet this new warfare of the mind and soul. It was certainly the fact that the democracies had become also plutocracies and imperialism that made them so slow and sluggish in the face of the Nazi lightning. And when the history of all this is finally written, it will be found that the reason why the Russians did so much better against the blitzkrieg than the others was that they were persuaded that the Communists, however mistakenly, had promised justice and security for the common man.

And how do we stand on the next psychological front—the preservation of the moral law? I do not mean to

ask if we have amongst us many people who flout that law by misdoing and injustice. There will always be many such as long as there is original sin. I mean to ask if there are those among us who deny the existence of that law. And the answer is, alas, yes; there are many such. In all our secular universities there are naturalists, materialists, positivists, in the chairs of learning, who have already worked in the minds of their students the revolution of which I speak. They usually call themselves anti-Nazi. But these are the very ones who have everywhere done Hitler's work in advance for him. He is still counting on them here.

It is the same with man's access to God. Freedom of worship still exists among us, and will exist as long as our Constitution exists. But there is more than one way of shutting off man's intercourse with his Creator. We have among us a lot of atheists who are itching for the day to come when they can put an end to religion. They have tried ridicule and pseudo-science in the colleges. They have taken God out of the ordinary ways of business and statecraft. They have got millions in the way of thinking that it is not so very bad after all for anyone to deny people access to God. When enough people think that way, then the way for the revolution is wide open.

We dare not let disguised Fascism conquer us from within, all the time that we are getting ready to beat down its physical arms on the field of battle. The next world peace conference will take place in the city of Washington, D. C. It will be presided over either by Adolf Hitler or by the President of the United States. Which it shall be will be determined by who wins the revolution much more than by who wins the mere war. We must not forget that the revolution is taking place in people's minds and wills.

What we are fighting for, then, is not a return to all our old ways. We do not want back the old imperialism, the old plutocracy, the old indifference to spir-

itual values in public life. Nor are we fighting to return the British Empire, or the corrupt Third French Republic, or other relics of the 19th century.

We want a revolution, too, for revolutions can be beaten only by a revolution. If there had been a revolution in London after 1776, then our own Revolution would not have succeeded, for the reason why it did succeed was because the parliamentary system in England had become corrupt. If we can make a revolution here, beating Hitler to it, a revolution of justice and charity and religion, then we need have no fear of his subtle and diabolical psychological warfare. It took Napoleon, too late to save America for England, to make England resurrect itself. Will Hitler do the same for us? If he does, please God that that also is not too late.

## Does Capitalism Want War?

*Reprinted from The CATHOLIC LEADER, Brisbane, Australia.*

**A** PREVAILING opinion, that the only people who profit by war are the capitalists, is not favored by J. L. Benvenisti, the well-known Catholic critic of the Capitalist system, and author of *The Iniquitous Contract*, *The Absentminded Revolution*, and other books which expose the evils of Capitalism. Taking the stand of the Papal Encyclicals, Mr. Benvenisti shows, among other facts, in *The Iniquitous Contract*, how the public loans for the first World War placed an undue burden upon the people. In an article in the *Catholic World*, he declares:

"I have no particular prejudice in favor of Capitalism, and no particular desire to defend it. Indeed I am quite as alive as any Communist to the internal contradictions of the Capitalist system. But to criticize a system and to criticize it very actively is one thing; to make it out to be the cause of pretty well every evil that has befallen the human race since the fall of man, is quite another."

Mr. Benvenisti points out the curious fact that the

aggressive character of capitalism has invariably been ascribed just to those sections of the business world to whom the peculiar code and the peculiar values of the soldier, are, if anything, rather repugnant—bankers and the financiers. "Bankers," he says, "detest war: the grounds of such detestation may be ignoble ones; . . . They detest it so much that they are quite blind to the kind of impulse that ultimately leads to it. It is a fact, and one which may one day arouse the incredulous perplexity of the historian, that the very last people to stop believing in the perennially pacific intentions of Hitler were the British banking houses." He describes war as "a rotten business proposition," and points out how England, through the first World War, lost markets which she never regained, and suffered a damage from which she has never recovered.

Dealing with the "radical fable" of the intrigues of the armament business, Mr. Benvenisti maintains that an "armament industry," strictly speaking, does not exist. There are in each country industries which can be switched over to the manufacture of armaments. We have seen that happen in Australia. Actual warfare brings into existence new factories for the production of munitions; but a permanent "armament industry" devoted exclusively to the manufacture of implements of war is discounted. The heavy taxes on war profits at the present time are an argument against those who say: "This is a capitalists' war," and "it will go on so long as they keep it going." Mr. Benvenisti holds that "war necessarily means for the heavy industry the creation of huge new speculative capital assets which will infallibly prove to be uneconomic on the return to peace; and capital, which for a year or two might show the resemblance of a decent yield, has then to be mercilessly written down."

At first sight, Mr. Benvenisti's opinion seems to conflict with the words of Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical on the Social Order, wherein he says:

This concentration of power (which he describes as the concentration of a "despotic economic domination" in the hands of a few) has, in its turn, led to a threefold struggle. First, there is the struggle for economic supremacy itself; then the fierce battle to acquire control of the State; so that its resources and authority may be abused in economic struggles; finally the clash between States themselves. This latter arises from two causes: because the nations apply their power and political influence to promote the economic advantages of their citizens; and because economic forces and economic domination are used to decide political controversies between nations. (*Quadragesimo Anno*).

But the two statements, that of Mr. Benvenisti and that of Pope Pius XI, may be reconciled. Pope Pius XI did not say that the capitalists, or Capitalism, wanted war, though he declared that the struggle for economic domination led to international conflict. Mr. Benvenisti seems to agree with that when he says that the bankers "detest war so much that they are blind to the kind of impulse that ultimately leads to it." Pope Pius XI shows that wars arise because nations apply their power and political influence to promote the economic advantages of their citizens, and because economic forces and economic domination are used to decide political controversies between nations.

Mr. Benvenisti regards it as highly improbable that, even in the mind of the aggressor, the fruits of victory are ever in any way computed in monetary terms. "In so far as we can give a sort of common denominator of war causes, it would seem reasonably correct to say that they arise chiefly from a desire for security. The aggressor says to himself 'I must take this piece of territory because if I do not take it the manpower and resources of my rivals may be strengthened'."

The foregoing statements, based on expert observation of facts, are something quite different from that pernicious and insidious propaganda that infiltrates through the mind of the population, a dangerous form of subversive whispering: "This is a capitalists' war." No impartial observer of what has happened during the last thirty years of crises in international affairs will deny that the evils in the capitalist system have

been a big factor, perhaps a dominant factor, in the causes of the present war; but in all this miserable disagreement, the bankers, the controllers of credit, the big industrial concerns, have been in much the same position as the inefficient business man who dreads bankruptcy, yet does the very things that lead to it. The capitalists stand to lose all and gain nothing by the present world conflict. Their losses in Europe, the Middle East, and particularly in China, Malaya and Java are beyond human calculation. Much better for them would have been the peacetime comfortable supervision of investments and profit-making, with big dividends, and the self-assurance that, because they did not want war, no one else would start it.

Another interesting point that should not be overlooked is that it was not the capitalists who started this war. They were prepared to lend Hitler any amount of money to pacify him. Of course, that was all in the struggle for economic domination—to strangle him with a loan. But it was not war. Hitler preferred war. The so-called capitalist countries, that are supposed to have wanted war, were not ready. Hitler had first crushed the capitalists within the Reich, and he led not a capitalist, but a Socialist State, when he set out in his mad career of world conquest. Hitler hypocritically declares that he is fighting for living room for his National Socialists. The so-called "capitalist" countries are fighting for the preservation of all that is left of European civilization and culture, and the ordinary man's human rights, decencies and liberties.

It would be well, therefore, to weigh well both sides of big questions that are glibly dismissed with a phrase. Evidence that the capitalists are reaping a harvest from the ruins of Europe and Asia is wanting; but there is evidence that the people who want to aggravate the class war between Labor and Capital, are using the catch-cry: "It's a capitalists' war."

# History of Present Dilemmas

STANLEY B. JAMES

*Reprinted from The CATHOLIC HERALD, London.*

**T**HE conduct of propaganda is like the painting of stage scenery; only large effects matter. Nations must be labelled in a manner calculated to impress the popular mind, which is incapable of taking in the more complex aspects of truth. That is a fact of which Goebbels, for one, is well aware. Pictures of John Bull and Uncle Sam sitting on bags of gold have become so familiarized to those he addresses that they can scarcely think of Englishmen and Americans except as plutocrats greedily seizing the world's wealth and shutting out all other peoples from participation. To some extent, at least, the same method is common to all engaged in the game. The term Democracy is used in so indiscriminate a manner that it can be applied even to the Russians, and the statement that we are fighting for Western Civilization is held to cover China and even to that section of the Indian public which, though anxious for the victory of the Allied Nations, is mainly concerned to cast off the yoke of British imperialism. In this business shades of opinion must be neglected. A whole nation, throughout its entire history, is branded with a character which, as a matter of fact, belongs only to a section and to that section only during a certain period.

Effective up to a point though the method is, as regards its immediate purpose and the public at which it is directed, it presents a serious obstacle to the more thoughtful in their endeavors to see the situation as it actually is, and the prejudices it creates must, in the days to come, make exceedingly difficult that mutual understanding of each other which is necessary if the process of peace-making is to be carried on successfully. Even as regards the generality, it is questionable whether this simplification is not overdone. The public

is not quite so gullible as the propagandists imagine. Our inquiry, therefore, as to the way in which the forces engaged in the struggle can be eventually harmonized must, at the outset, seek to correct the impressions thus created.

### ACTION AND REACTION

One of the impressions that has to be corrected is that the evils held up for reprobation have had their birth on the soil where they now flourish and are to be identified exclusively with the nations which most conspicuously manifest them. This is to ignore the historical sequence leading up to the present position. Even if we were speaking of the world as a whole it would be true to say that no country can escape entirely the effects of political, social and cultural revolutions taking place in other countries. But if we confine ourselves to the western world this holds good to an even greater extent. The history of any one part cannot be written without constant reference to what was going on among the neighbors of the country concerned, and an examination of the European past goes a long way to destroy the myth of specific racial qualities peculiar to this and that people. To illustrate this, it is not necessary to delve into the distant past. Examples occur nearer our own time.

There can be, for instance, no true understanding of the present crisis that does not take into account the consequences of the Napoleonic invasions, which were, for the early nineteenth century, what German aggression is for us. But for the humiliations to which Napoleon subjected a divided Germany there would have been no such unification as that which Bismarck effected. The birth of German nationalism was the direct heritage of that phase. It was then that modern Germany was born, so that one may say that, had there been no Napoleon, there would have been no Hitler.



No less instructive is the story of Napoleon's campaign in Italy, the rise of the Risorgimento, the incorporation with the rest of Italy of the Papal States, and the accession of Victor Emmanuel as sovereign of a united Italy. The liberalism characteristic of the new regime strongly favored the cause of oppressed nationalities. Garibaldi's visit to London provoked unbounded enthusiasm, and even the dissolute Byron was moved to give his life for the freedom of Greece. If Germany and Italy manifest a nationalistic temper which is endangering the world, we owe the inception of this spirit to the Corsican adventurer and to a movement the stronghold of which was in our own country. It required but the provisions of the Versailles Treaty, which were considered by both the countries named as humiliating, to rouse again the patriotism thus engendered.

### REVOLUTION VERSUS REVOLUTION

How tangled is the story can be seen by following the reactions which followed the Russian Revolution. The way for the internationalism of the Communist movement had been prepared by liberalism. Freemasonry and International Finance had done much to weaken loyalty to country and race. The successive Governments typical of the period became so corrupt as to lose the respect of the governed and indiscipline became rife. Communism batted on the discontent thus engendered and increased the confusion. The defeatist spirit that followed was particularly rife in Italy at the beginning of the last war. It was against this that Mussolini—who had passed through Socialistic, Syndicalist and Communist phases—reacted. Fascism started as an effort to revive the national spirit and to impose on a people whom liberal laxity had enfeebled a discipline whereby they might recover their place in the world. To say this is not to condone the excesses to which it ran or the unbridled lust for power of which

it became the expression. It is necessary, however, to trace its genesis in preceding conditions and to observe how it reacted to the international ideology adopted by the liberalism professed by Garibaldi, Mazzini and Cavour.

It was not wholly due, however, to a reaction against the new liberalism. The Socialism which emphasized the importance of the State, the Syndicalism expounded by the Frenchman, Sorel, which looked for the deliverance of the workers to violence rather than to political measures, and the personal dictatorship which had been established by Lenin played their part in the synthesis finally effected.

The significance of this will be seen when we recall the fact that it is this movement, originating in Italy, that has given its name to the ideology supposed to represent the outlook of Germany, Japan and unoccupied France. The classification surely shows a lack of discrimination. Nevertheless, it is permissible to ask whether, if there had been no Mussolini, there would have been a Hitler.

### IMPERIALISM

Another example of the same sequence is to be found in the undoubted influence of British Imperialism in provoking the expansionist movements characteristic of the Axis. We are not here attempting to adjudicate but only to present an objective view of the historical facts. Nevertheless, it may not be amiss if we find room to point out the difference between a colonization which develops the resources of countries inhabited by uncivilized peoples and an imperialism which, finding such empty spaces as once existed already occupied, turns upon neighbors as civilized as itself.

The manner of our colonization meant that we were able to establish overseas communities of our own kinsmen with whom we could maintain a voluntary asso-

ciation based less on legal forms than on the possession of a common tradition. One of the questions which will arise in the future is as to how far this model can be generally applied.

The point is, however, that the problem of an outlet for congested countries and the supply of raw material necessary in the case of a highly developed civilization is a common one. If others have adopted our solution but in an unscrupulous manner, it might be argued that the circumstances of our Empire-building were different and that, given those circumstances, they might have acted in a way as comparatively free from objection as that adopted by ourselves.

### THE RACIAL MYTH

The conclusion to which these and other facts bring us is that the attribution to particular peoples of guilt for the present state of things is apt to mislead. We might sum up the position in the words of the author of a little book entitled *World Revolution*. "The danger of a racial approach to the problems of our times," says the author, "is all the greater because it involves, at bottom, an inverted Nazi philosophy. Stigmatizing a particular race as inferior or wicked not only means patting one's own race on the back but it kindles race consciousness in other peoples and, above all, it obscures the fundamental social character of the deeper causes of the international crisis. It would be blind folly to ignore the similarity of the problems which today face people all over the world."

The very fact that all, irrespective of the side on which they stand in the conflict, proclaim themselves pledged to the establishment of a New Order indicates the prevalence of discontent with the Old Order. Beneath the struggle is a profound dissatisfaction with the conditions of life today which is common to all. Our antagonisms arise from the difference between the ways in which respectively we would solve the prob-

lem. If this dissatisfaction can be united in a combined effort, the end of the tragedy will be in sight. But first we must acknowledge a community of guilt.

## Wealth Out of Poverty

*Reprinted from The New Zealand TABLET.*

**O**F RECENT times universities have come to be looked on as institutions with little interest in or connection with the ordinary social life of the communities to which they belong. Too often they seem to be in the country but not of it, too much concerned with intellectual and cultural matters and too little with the practical affairs which occupy the attention of the ordinary people.

In the little town of Antigonish in Nova Scotia, however, there is a University named after Saint Francis Xavier which is a striking exception to this general rule. Saint Francis Xavier University is not famous for the sporting achievements or the academic distinctions of its students; it is probable that fifteen years ago its mere existence was known to very few people outside the province of Nova Scotia. But during this period it had begun a social experiment which has attracted the attention of sociologists not only in America, but in many other parts of the world.

The economic conditions of the great majority of the people of Eastern Canada are very poor. During the troubled period which followed the Great War, there was a feeling among many connected with the University that something should be done to make the University a practical factor in the lives of the people. After the whole position had been carefully investigated, a decision was reached to launch some scheme of adult education.

The authorities realized that they would have to devise some method that would not make too many

demands on the meager resources of the University. Saint Francis Xavier University is not richly endowed like many of its fellow institutions of the North American continent. Fortunately, however, there were on the staff men of Apostolic faith and confidence; and, prominent among these were Fathers Tomkins and Coady.

Very soon the University established an Extension Department in order to educate the people effectively and inexpensively by means of discussion circles and study clubs. Usually people were first interested in the movement and in learning the principles of cooperation by the calling of a mass meeting in each community.

#### ORGANIZING THE GROUPS

In 1929, shortly after the Extension Department had been opened, the director, Dr. Coady, was requested by the Dominion Department of Fisheries to undertake the organization of the distressed fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. Dr. Coady, realizing what an excellent opportunity had been given, spent the year in travelling through the Maritime Fishing Areas. Having studied the position, he organized the fishermen into a group, called United Maritime Fishermen, which gave this scattered class a voice that could be heard and an influence that could make itself felt. Previously, as isolated individuals, they had been at the mercy of the large purchasing organizations. Now, as a united body, they were able to bargain much more effectively.

When they began to understand the full implication of the cooperative movement, the organized fishermen of Nova Scotia were not satisfied with collective bargaining. During the terrible depression, these hitherto dispirited men proceeded with the establishment of their own cooperative lobster factories. By 1938, they were the biggest lobster producers in the world, with a turnover exceeding a million dollars.

Among the farmers, progress has been less spectac-

lar. Even in this hard-headed group, however, the educational efforts of the Extension Department have slowly but surely borne fruit. The success that has accompanied group buying of consumer goods has helped to convince these farmers that the welfare of both the individual and the community is better served by cooperative methods than by rugged individualism.

While the movement was developing in the fishing and farming areas, the leaders made occasional visits to the coal mining areas, where they had reason to expect that their task would be much more difficult. The poverty-stricken conditions under which the miners worked inclined them to give a very sympathetic hearing to the radical views of Communist agitators, so much so, that in the Cape Breton region the miners were looked on as the spear-head of the Communist Movement in Canada. By skilful maneuvering, these extremist elements were threatening to gain control of the United Mine Workers' organization. The situation prevailing during the early 1930's was, therefore, anything but inviting to the Extension workers. Nevertheless, they decided to see if their program of cooperation would be of any assistance in clearing up the confusion. They were perhaps fortunate in that the miners were sympathetic towards group action because of the success of the British Canadian Cooperative established in Eastern Canada many years before.

What really attracted their attention, however, was group action in the monetary field. Extension workers applied the technique that had achieved success in the Credit Union Movement in the United States. In their efforts they were given valuable assistance by some of the latter's experienced leaders.

By this time, the Government of Nova Scotia was so favorably impressed by the work that, in 1932, a law was enacted permitting the formation of cooperative banks in the Province.

## WHAT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED

Interest aroused by the movement has not been of a merely local nature, nor confined to the Province of Nova Scotia. Before the scheme was undertaken, those in charge were firmly convinced that no really worthwhile work could be done for the people of Nova Scotia unless economic and social forces in the whole country were influenced. They saw in the cooperative movement a means not merely of improving the economic conditions of a few scattered miners, farmers or fishermen. They saw, in addition, a way to prevent the swing of the pendulum from the disastrous extreme of rugged individualism to the other equally disastrous extreme of Communism.

So far has the influence of the cooperative movement spread, that its leaders now regard Nova Scotia as merely a social laboratory in which to carry out their educational experiments. They have every reason to feel satisfied with their progress, and with the reputation that they have established in other parts of Canada.

In 1935, the Ministry of Fisheries entered into an agreement with the Saint Francis Xavier University, whereby the University undertook the task of educating the fishermen in the province of New Brunswick. The sum of \$6,000 first granted for the work has since been increased to \$36,000.

The fact that other members of the Dominion Parliament of Canada have commented favorably on the work is very pleasing; but what is even more gratifying is the helpful attitude taken up by Church leaders of all denominations. For instance, the Moderator of the United Church considers that the movement, which has been the economic salvation of the fishermen of Nova Scotia, might well be applied in a larger way in other industries and to other parts of Canada.

Perhaps this movement of such humble beginnings

may point the way to peace between capital and labor. The cooperative movement does offer peace, harmony and progress, but only when profit gives place to service.

## The Ten Points

*The following ten points were contained in the Joint Pastoral Letter of the Hierarchy of England and Wales on the Social Question issued June, 1942 and signed on behalf of the Hierarchy by Arthur Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster; Richard, Archbishop of Liverpool; Thomas, Archbishop of Birmingham; and Michael, Archbishop of Cardiff.*

*Reprinted from The CATHOLIC GAZETTE.*

**I**N the section headed *The Minimum that Christians should accept* the Metropolitans write: "Recently we have heard many discussions of the various conditions on which people have insisted as minimum conditions for civilized life. We suggest the following as minimum conditions for a Christian way of life."

Then follow the Ten Points:

1. A living wage. Wages should be sufficient not only for a moderately comfortable life but sufficient for saving as well. Less than this is unjust.

2. The payment of this wage should be the first charge on every industry.

3. The chief factors that should determine the amount of a man's wages are (a) an agreed standard of work; (b) the capacity of the industry to pay; (c) an agreed minimum average family, e.g. father, mother and three or four children.

4. When an employer cannot pay this minimum living wage the difference should be made up. This could be done either by industry pooling a percentage of all wages paid and sharing the proceeds according to needs; or in default of this, by the state.

Employers and employed should be regarded as partners, not as rivals; they should unite to secure the best conditions for work, the fairest division of output and



the maximum of harmony. Cut-throat competition which leads to low prices and sweated labor should give place to the coordination of each trade or industry within itself, and to cooperation with other trades and industries in organization for the common good.

5. A wife ought not to be obliged to go out to work in order to make up the wages of a family to a minimum living wage.

6. The minimum living accommodation for a family should be such that no one has to sleep in the living-room; that there be satisfactory sanitation; that there be a bathroom for each family. Slums should be abolished, there is no excuse for slums.

7. There should be a ban on the manufacture and sale of birth-prevention appliances.

8. There should be a ban on the manufacture and sale of obscene books, and there should be a board set up by the publishing associations to regulate this.

9. Religious education, to meet the wishes of the parents, should be available to all school children, and on such conditions that the general education of the child should not suffer in any way from its parents' insistence on religious education.

10. The enormous inequality in the distribution of wealth in this country, and the consequent control of the lives of the masses by a comparatively few rich people, is against social justice. We have seen in our own days the growth of large and powerful groups, industrial and financial, sometimes competing, sometimes cooperating, but pursuing always their own interests at the expense of the common welfare. Under the strong pressure of war much of this evil has been checked by the authority of the state. Both profits and prices are now controlled in the national interest. The war, in fact, has clearly shown that there is no practical difficulty in solving the main problems of economics. All that is needed is a sufficiently compelling motive, a common purpose. But is that common

purpose only to be found in war? The national interest in matters of profits and prices does not differ in peace time from what it is in war time. The same means, the same men and materials are available in peace no less than in war. It is the purpose only that is wanting, the common force of minds and will that is lacking.

## The Soldier's Code of Chivalry

*Reprinted from The Advocate, Australia.*

THE truism that "War is Hell," uttered by an American general during the Civil War, has been quoted with wearisome frequency ever since by the leaders and press of the democratic countries. In years which we can all remember, when the False Dawn over Geneva drew the attention of "progressive thinkers" everywhere, these words were commonly taken as a text by those who denounced the national traditions which "romanticized" the soldier-hero, and glorified military valor and military chivalry. Books like *All Quiet on the Western Front* were best-sellers, because they illustrated the foulness and degradation of the soldier's life, and exposed the "illusion" of a great cause which made his sacrifice and misery worth while. *Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*—such mottoes, it was declared, cast a false halo around a thing utterly horrible. If men are to have peace, we were told, there must be an end of such nonsense. The profession of arms, at best, was as repulsive as that of a public executioner, and no more worthy of admiration.

Today, the "progressives" of the left who long proclaimed their loathing of military service have changed their tune—none are so zealous as they in the battle to destroy "Fascism": none so utterly convinced that the whole future of humanity depends upon the triumph of the United Nations. Yet, even now, they have

not abandoned their contempt for traditional soldier-ship and soldierly codes of chivalry. Those who formerly condemned them as a gilding of licensed gangsterism now object to them on the ground that they encourage a "false humanity" towards the enemy which is weakening to our morale and determination. We must think and speak of the Germans and Japanese only as monsters and vermin; where they display courage, it must be described as "savage determination"; where they show intelligence, it must be presented as the false subtlety of demons. Courtesies between opposing forces invariably evoke a sneer from some journalist who correlates a "democratic outlook" with guttersnipe manners, and regards the chivalry of gallant officers as a sign of weakmindedness or lack of zeal.

We have seen a recent example of this hatred of civilized observances hitherto customary in war in the growls of wrath which have been evoked by the grant of service honors to the Japanese who perished in the submarine attack on Sydney. No just or reasonable man, we believe, can fail to admit the truth of Admiral Gould's words, that "courage as shown by these seamen should be recognized and universally admired" by friend and foe alike. For the rest, this tribute was not only well merited by the heroes who served their country so valiantly, it was also calculated to produce an excellent effect upon the minds of our enemies. The concern of the Japanese that due honor should be paid to their dead is well known; and the news of this courtesy will not fail to increase their respect for Australia—many of whose sons are now prisoners in their hands. All this, apparently, means nothing to those who hold the doctrine that "total war" implies total hatred. That these men—Orientals as well as enemies—should lie with honor in Australian ground is to them an intolerable outrage.

We can see the same ruthless spirit at work in the

admiration invariably shown by certain press commentators for the technique of guerrilla-fighting, and their zest for "new ways of war" which involve instruction in such arts as strangling, back-stabbing, cutting throats, poisoning wells and so forth. Just as they loathe those personal expressions of respect between combatants which testify to a human feeling between them, so they rejoice in the type of action which tends, more than any other, to give personal expression to hatred, and to obliterate the distinctions generally observed in war among civilized peoples—the distinction between civilian and soldier, between armed violence and mere animal savagery. For them the true "People's War" — as fought in Spain and Russia—is a war in which no one observes a code of any sort; its hero is the most efficiently ruthless killer, its method a destructive action which stamps all human considerations underfoot, proceeding by "scorched earth," private assassination, and a sabotage which may involve hundreds of innocent victims. In years past, these men poured contempt and loathing upon the profession of arms—they seem, today, to be anxious to justify that attitude by seeking to obliterate the distinction between the trained soldier and the expert thug. "War is Hell," they cry—and proceed to make it doubly hellish.

The spectacle of the horror of modern mechanized war should not lead us to ignore the truth that, in many respects, war has already been humanized by the mutual agreement of nations. The merciful work of the Red Cross is extended by each of the opposing armies to the wounded of the other, and has saved millions of lives; the treatment of prisoners of war today is a most happy contrast, on the whole, to that which prevailed during the last century. These developments, and others favorable to the civil populations of occupied territories, have become possible because men have felt more deeply the claims of a humanity which

transcends the conflicts between nations. That same sense of humanity has dignified the profession of the soldier, and imposed upon him a code of honor to be observed even in the midst of battle; and, if the one declines and disappears, the other will soon follow it. Finally, if the spirit of gangsterism and inhumanity becomes generally prevalent, it will not cease to exist by magic when the leaders announce an armistice. We shall have destroyed the bridges which lead back to peace and reconciliation, so that, in one form or another, the hell of war will become our portion, and that of our children, through a long Age of Iron.

## Some Things New and Old

### INQUISITION

*Is it true, as I have heard an anti-Catholic lecturer state, that the Church in the Middle Ages forced people to accept the Faith?*

No, it is not true, because faith is the gift of God, and you cannot force God's supernatural gifts on anyone against his will. What you probably have in your mind is an old and hoary fable regarding the Inquisition.

Now there were two Inquisitions, which most people do not realize—the Holy Roman Inquisition and the Spanish Inquisition. The Roman Inquisition originated in 1227, when Pope Gregory IX appointed judges or inquisitors to deal with anti-social heretics. The later Roman Inquisition for the safeguarding of Faith and Morals was founded by Pope Paul III in 1542, with power to act as a supreme doctrinal tribunal for the entire Catholic world.

The Spanish Inquisition, on the other hand, was established in 1478 by Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, and its function was to deal with lapsed converts and

apostates whose secret activities were a danger to both Church and state.

Now the Inquisition, both the Roman and the Spanish, had no interest whatsoever in attempting to force reluctant persons into the Catholic Church. As a matter of fact, its activities were concerned entirely with those who professed the Catholic Religion, or pretended to do so. The earlier Roman Inquisition, over which the Dominicans presided, was never active in the British Isles or the states of Germany. The Spanish Inquisition, on the other hand, was active both in Spain and the Spanish dominions on the American Continent.

### SATAN

*Is Satan a real person, or is the name used just to denote the principle of evil that exists in the world?*

Satan, or the Devil, which is merely an English rendition of the Greek word *Diabolos* meaning the Slanderer, is indeed a very real person, as you will discover by a careful reading of your Bible.

First of all there is what the Apocalypse says, chapter xii, verse 7: "And there was a battle in heaven; Michael and his angels battled with the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels." Go on with the chapter and read what happened to him "who is called the Devil and Satan." This is proof number one that Satan is a person.

Next, read the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, chapter iv, verses 1-11, which recounts the temptation of Our Lord by Satan. And in Saint John's Gospel, chapter viii, verse 44, here is what Our Lord said of Satan: "... he is a liar and the father of lies." That again is proof that Satan is a person and not an abstract idea.

This same Lucifer, which is called Satan and the Devil, is a pure spirit, and his angels are pure spirits.

Pure, that is to say, not in the moral order, since he is "a liar and the father of lies," but in the sense that he and his followers are purely spiritual beings. They were created by God in the spiritual order, and they fell, not through any sins of the flesh, because they are not human. But they rebelled, and from being spiritual beings essentially good, they became spiritual beings thoroughly evil. Of them Aquinas says: "Since a spirit is immaterial his fall cannot have been due to fleshly or material desires, but only to spiritual ones."

And not only is Satan a real person, but having been created one of the angels of God, he is a spirit of the most exalted intellectual order. The Devil is no fool! And his great spiritual intelligence is devoted entirely and absolutely to evil ends—to thwart the designs of God Who created him and to tempt man to his fall.

### JESUIT BISHOPS

*Are there any Jesuit bishops, and if so, who are they?*

There are quite a few archbishops and bishops who are members of the Society of Jesus, the majority of them being missionaries. Two of these prelates who are not missionaries are His Eminence Pietro Cardinal Boetto, S.J., Archbishop of Genoa, and the Most Rev. Anthony Schular, S.J., Bishop of El Paso, Texas.

The missionary prelates are: Archbishop Roberts of Bombay, Archbishop Perrier of Calcutta, Archbishop Doering of Poona, Bishop Laudadio of Galle, Bishop Robichez of Trincomalee, Bishop Heredia of Guayaquil, Bishop Proserpio of Calicut, Bishop Agniswami of Kotar, Bishop Leonard of Madura, Bishop Sullivan of Patna, Bishop Severin of Ranchi, Bishop Roche of Tuticorin, Bishop Hayes of Cagayan, Bishop Del Rosario of Zamboanga.

Those mentioned above are territorial bishops. There are other Jesuit titular bishops on the missions with

the rank of Vicar Apostolic — Alaska two, British Guiana, British Honduras, seven in China, two in the Congo, Jamaica, Japan, two in Java, two in Madagascar, one in Southern Rhodesia.

There are two Jesuits with the rank of Prefect Apostolic in China, one each in Colombia and Northern Rhodesia. Archbishop Profitlich, S. J. is Apostolic Administrator of Esthonia, and there are two Jesuit bishops in the Caroline and Marshall Islands of the Pacific. The Apostolic Administrators of Matto Grosso in Brazil and of Hiroshima in Japan are Jesuits.

### PHILIPPINE APOSTLES

*Who were the first Catholics to evangelize the Philippine Islands?*

The first Catholic missionaries to bring the Faith to the Philippine Islands (there were no Protestant missionaries then) were the Augustinians, who established the Church at Manila in 1565. In 1577 the Franciscans arrived in the islands, and in 1578 the diocese of Manila was erected by Rome.

Other missionaries followed. The Jesuits arrived in 1581 with Bishop Domingo de Salazar, and in 1587 a company of Dominican friars arrived, and members of other Orders took up missionary work in later years. But the pioneer Catholic missionaries to the Philippines were the Augustinian Friars.

For about four centuries the work of the Church in the Philippines was largely in the hands of Spanish Religious. The last Spanish Archbishop of Manila was a Dominican friar, Dr. Bernardino Nozaleda, who resigned his See in 1901, and was succeeded by the first American Archbishop of Manila, Dr. Jeremiah J Harty, a native of St. Louis, Missouri.